

REMARKS

Drawings

Applicants' file indicates that figures 1 and 2 may have been left off from this application. Accordingly attached are figures 1 and 2 in case the PTO record also lacks figures 1 and 2 from this application.

The figures are incorporated by reference as reflected on the Utility Patent Application Transmittal form PTO/SB/05 (11-00), box 18 for inadvertently omitted materials from the parent.

The specification is amended to add a brief description of drawings, which are the same that were added in the patented parent of this application.

Claim Amendments

Support for the amendments can be found, for example, on page 3, line 25 to page 4, line 2; page 4, lines 23-26, page 6, lines 12-13, page 8, lines 24 to page 9, line 5, and in example 5.

The Objection to the Priority Statement in the Specification

The first paragraph of the specification is amended to overcome the objection.

The Rejections Under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The rejections to the form of the claims are moot in view of the amendments.

The Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

The rejection under 35 USC § 103 over Yamane (JP 07-246366) in view of Kadokura (JP-63126818) is respectfully traversed.

Yamane teaches pigments that have a $\geq 90\%$ total reflectance. See abstract. It appears that the reflection of $\geq 90\%$ total reflectance refers to or at least encompasses behavior in the visible light region. See, for example, paragraph [0025] discussing interference with "light" to have a reflection factor of 90% or more; and at various locations in the disclosure discussing "reflected light" and "beam-of-light reflection factor."

The pigments of Yamane are taught to be applicable for coatings on automobiles. See

paragraph [0022].

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to select a pigment of a reference that teaches a pigment useful for automobiles and has a $\geq 90\%$ total reflectance for an agricultural film that contains a pigment having high transmissibility in the visible region of light because plants need visible light for their growth (see page 8, last full paragraph of applicants' specification). The Yamane pigment (and coatings containing it) do not have high transmissibility to light.

One of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use the pigment of Yamane in an agricultural film as that pigment reflects $\geq 90\%$ of the light needed by a plant for growth.

The Office Action alleges that Kadokura teaches application of an optical interference substance to both a vehicle and an agricultural film while citing the abstract. Applicants respectfully disagree. The abstract teaches uses as “additive for cosmetic, coating compound, agricultural film, etc., having excellent ultraviolet light screening ability and improved dispersibility into vehicles.” (Emphasis added.) The term “vehicles” in the quoted passage does not refer to use on an automobile as such would not make sense. The uses are the underlined section. The “vehicle” in the cited context refers to a carrier or medium into which the pigments are mixed into and in which they have improved dispersibility. Thus, the allegation that this reference teaches the use of the same pigments for both vehicles (automobiles) and for agricultural films is incorrect, i.e., the reference does not teach or suggest that the uses on automobiles and plants are “merely an alternate equivalent application performing the same intended function” as alleged. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the Yamane and Kadokura teachings.

Regardless, such combination would not suggest the claimed pigments. Yamane teaches pigments having $\geq 90\%$ total reflectance. Kadokura teaches metal oxides with leaf substances that have excellent ultraviolet light screening ability. Kadokura does not teach the reflectance or transmissivity behavior of the pigments in the visible light range or in the near ultraviolet light range. This combination does not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed invention.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908
John A. Sopp, Reg. No. 33, 103
Attorney/Agents for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: MERCK-1963-D01

Date: August 18, 2004

\\homer\clients\Merck\1963-D01\Reply Aug 04.doc